

REMARKS

The Office Action dated March 24, 2004 has been received and carefully considered. In this response, claims 1-3, 5, 7-10, 12-15, 18, 19, 21-23, 27, 29 and 31 have been amended, claims 20 and 30 have been canceled and claim 32 has been added. Claims 1-19, 21-29, 31 and 32 therefore are pending. Support for the amendments to the claims and the addition of the new claim may be found in the specification and figures as originally filed. Entry of the new claim and the amendments to the claims therefore is respectfully requested. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in the present application is further respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

Objection to Claims 3, 9, 10 and 31

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 3, 9, 10 and 31 were objected to for including abbreviations. The Applicants have amended claims 3, 9, 10 and 31 to include the full terms for the abbreviations. Withdrawal of this objection therefore is respectfully requested.

Antecedent Basis Rejection of Claim 12

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 12 was rejected as having insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "wherein the request." Claim 12 has been amended to recite the limitation "wherein the interrupt," antecedent support for which may be found in claim 11. Withdrawal of this rejection therefore is respectfully requested.

Anticipation Rejection of Claims 1-5, 7, 9, 11, 13-19 and 29-31

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-5, 7, 9, 11, 13-19 and 29-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Rim (U.S. Patent No. 5,841,472). This rejection is respectfully traversed with amendment.

Claim 1, from which claims 2-14 depend, recites, in part, the limitations of determining whether to enable audio stream data related to a transport packet to be received by a system or to discard the transport packet, based at least in part on a first outcome of a comparison of a value of a first field in the transport packet to a value of a first field register. With respect to these limitations, the Examiner asserts that "figure 14 shows an error indicating mechanism which is used to enable or reject audio stream data." Office Action, p. 3. The Applicant respectfully

submits that the Office Action fails to establish that Figure 14 of Rim or the related passages of Rim provide any disclosure or suggestion related to enabling the reception of audio stream data or the rejection of audio stream based on the comparison of a value of a field of a transport packet with another value. As Rim teaches, "Fig. 14 illustrates a table of interrupt generation in a transport decoder 21 of the invention," where the interrupts are generated based on a comparison of the PID field in the "transport packet head" to "the PID in the packet which the user wants [sic]." Rim, col. 7, lines 22 and 23 and col. 7, lines 46 and 47. However, Rim provides no disclosure or suggestion of enabling the reception of audio stream data or the discarding of the transport packet based in part on the comparison of the PIDs or the resulting interrupt. In the event that the Examiner continues to assert that Rim discloses these limitations in view of the remarks herein, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner more particularly demonstrate how Rim teaches these limitations.

Because Rim fails to disclose or suggest at least the noted limitations, Rim necessarily fails to disclose or suggest each and every limitation of claim 1. Rim also fails to disclose each and every limitation of claims 2-14 at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1. Moreover, these claims recite additional features that are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, alone or in combination.

Claim 15, from which claims 16-31 depend, has been amended to recite, in part, the similar limitations of an audio decoding system having an input coupled to an output of a first comparator of an audio parser, the audio decoding system including an elementary stream formatter for processing audio data associated with a data word into an elementary stream, wherein the audio decoding system is enabled to process the audio data or to discard the audio data associated with the data word based at least in part on the output of the first comparator. Support for these amendments may be found, *inter alia*, in claims 19 and 20 (now canceled) as originally filed. As similarly noted above, the Applicant respectfully submits that Rim fails to disclose or suggest the limitations of enabling the processing of audio data into an elementary stream or discarding the audio data based at least in part on the output of a comparator of an audio parser as presently recited in claim 15. Rim therefore fails to disclose or suggest each and every limitation of claim 15 and thus fails to disclose each and every limitation of claims 16-19, 21-29 and 31 at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 15. Moreover, these claims recite additional features neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the anticipation rejection is improper at this time and withdrawal of this rejection therefore is respectfully requested.

Obviousness Rejection of Claims 6, 8, 10, 12 and 20-28

At page 7 of the Office Action, claims 8, 20, 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(b) as being unpatentable over Rim in view of Magee (U.S. Patent No. 5,835,493). At page 9 of the Office Action, claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(b) as being unpatentable over Rim in view of Takahashi (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,352). At page 9 of the Office Action, claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(b) as being unpatentable over Rim in view of Van Steenbrugge (U.S. Patent No. 6,076,062). At page 10 of the Office Action, claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(b) as being unpatentable over Rim in view of Magee and further in view of Van Steenbrugge. At page 11 of the Office Action, claims 24, 25 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(b) as being unpatentable over Rim in view of Graham-Cumming (U.S. Patent No. 6,182,146). At page 12 of the Office Action, claim 28 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(b) as being unpatentable over Rim in view of Graham-Cumming and further in view of Magee. At page 13 of the Office Action, claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(b) as being unpatentable over Rim in view of Graham-Cumming and further in view of Takahashi. These rejections are respectfully traversed with amendment.

Claim 1, from which claims 6, 8, 10 and 12 depend, recites, in part, the limitations of determining whether to enable audio stream data related to a transport packet to be received by a system or to discard the transport packet, based at least in part on a first outcome of a comparison of a value of a first field in the transport packet to a value of a first field register. Claim 15, from which claims 20-28 depend, presently recites, in part, the similar limitations of an audio decoding system having an input coupled to an output of a first comparator of an audio parser, the audio decoding system including an elementary stream formatter for processing audio data associated with a data word into an elementary stream, wherein the audio decoding system is enabled to process the audio data or to discard the audio data associated with the data word based at least in part on the output of the first comparator. As noted above, the Office Action fails to establish that Rim discloses or suggests at least these limitations. In addition, the Office Action fails to establish that Magee, Takahashi, or Graham-Cumming disclose or suggest these limitations. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Office Action fails to establish that

the proposed combinations of Rim, Magee, Takahashi and Graham-Cumming disclose or even suggest each and every limitation of claims 1 and 15 and therefore fails to establish that the proposed combinations of Rim, Magee, Takahashi and Graham-Cumming disclose or even suggest each and every limitation of claims 6, 8, 10, 12 and 20-28 at least by virtue of their dependency from one of claims 1 or 15. Moreover, these claims recite additional limitations that are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejections of claims 6, 8, 10, 12 and 20-28 are improper at this time and withdrawal of these rejections therefore is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

The Applicant does not believe that any additional fees are due, but if the Commissioner believes additional fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-0441.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

Ryan S. Davidson, Reg. No. 51,596,
On Behalf Of
J. Gustav Larson, Reg. No. 39,263,
Attorney for Applicant
TOLER, LARSON & ABEL, L.L.P.
5000 Plaza On The Lake, Suite 265
Austin, Texas 78746
(512) 327-5515 (phone) (512) 327-5452 (fax)